1 MS. FOSHEE: Okay, let me --2 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Right. 3 MS. FOSHEE: Okay. 4 COMMISSIONER BAKER: I don't need your opinion on what's most valuable. 5 6 MS. FOSHEE: Sure. Let's look at --7 COMMISSIONER BAKER: I mean, if -- but just for clarification, aside from the numbers contained in column A, 8 none of these other numbers contained in the other columns 9 10 are within the prefiled testimony or -- of any of the parties? 11 The -- yes, the staff actually 12 MS. FOSHEE: 13 admitted the rates in column B yesterday. So that's an exhibit. 14 15 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Okay. 16 MS. FOSHEE: Our proposed filed costs are relied upon by Mr. Gillan in his testimony. 17 18 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Okay. 19 MS. FOSHEE: The rate in the enterprise DS0 20 platform agreement was also admitted by the Commission 21 yesterday when you took administrative notice of all the 22 commercial agreements. So I believe they are all in the 23 record. 24 BY MS. FOSHEE:

Mr. Gillan, looking at column B compared to

25

0

BellSouth's proposed cost, which is the cost upon which you relied, do you see that that's a 36 percent margin?

A 36 percent between what and what? Just -- just make sure I understand what you're saying.

Q Absolutely. If you look under column D -- and the way you read this chart is you look column -- go down and across.

A Okay.

Q So column D compared to BellSouth's proposed cost, 36 percent margin. You see that?

A Okay, let's -- let's go through this, just so you understand the things that you don't do correctly. You're trying -- this 23 percent -- now I understand what you're -- the 23 percent, I suppose, is you're claiming that you're only making 23 percent over cost; right? But you've added all this stuff up that there's no question that Momentum is entitled to. The only thing the Commission should be looking at, because the only rate that we're talking about here is the port rate. You're taking something that has a cost of \$1.50. Well, it's port plus usage plus features.

Q That's what you did, though; right?

A Port plus usage plus features. No, you added in the loop to try and mask the amount by which your rates are above cost. You added in the -- you have a problem that says that the loop rate is \$3 lower than it should be, and

you're trying to make it sound like that it's relevant to this calculation.

Loops aren't at issue here, at least these types of loops. What is at issue is the switching rate. The switching rate is these three items which I have to add up to see if you're even close to what I think this is supposed to be. Oh, I hate math.

You're taking something that's 6.58, you say, which seems a little high, but -- and you're trying to raise that rate to about \$15; okay? That's not a 23 percent increase, that's like a doubling or more. All right, that -- so your number here is the 50 percent -- is like a -- is like whatever, 100 percent. All right? Not 23 percent, when all you do is you look at the rates that are at issue in this proceeding, which is switching.

Then you go over and you try to calculate margins that Momentum has. And there's two things that you've completely ignored. First of all, Momentum also has to pay you for daily usage files, which is another direct cost Momentum experiences that's not insignificant that you haven't included.

And, finally, you haven't included any of

Momentum's costs. They have direct costs when they win

customers and serve them that are also not insignificant.

So you can't be calculating anything that -- that you can

characterize as a margin that Momentum experiences, because you've left out important cost categories for things you charge Momentum that you didn't include that they'd have to recover, and you've completely ignored any of Momentum's costs, as well.

That is not -- those numbers are not for Momentum margins above direct cost, and the number that you presented for yourself you -- you tried to diminish by including rate elements that aren't at issue in the proceeding. So you've understated yours by a giant amount, and you've overstated theirs by a giant amount. And the -- and the chart is totally worthless for any point that you're hoping to make.

- Q Did you review the staff's recommendation that was approved by the Commission today, Mr. Gillan?
 - A Only the rates in it.
- Q Okay. So you didn't look at the estimated usage that was in what is now the Commission's order?
- A No, I did not.

Q Okay. So if -- if, in fact, that 2.55 was drawn from the Commission-approved rates, you wouldn't know that?

A I have not checked it against that figure. I used an estimated usage from ARMIS that you had used. But, again, you know what, it doesn't matter because you could make that a dollar -- make that line a dollar or make it \$3.

I don't care. Everything else you did with this that is so

completely wrong just makes it -- I'm trying to think of a polite term for it. And a polite term is escaping me.

- Q Go ahead and use the heroin dealer thing again, because that was so relevant.
 - A I'm glad you read the footnotes, Ms. Foshee.
- Q Would 149 percent margin be just and reasonable in your opinion?
 - A There is no 149 percent margin here.
- Q Let me ask hypothetically. Would a 149 percent margin be just and reasonable in your opinion? Yes or no?
- A No. But margin, as people who do any of this kind of work typically refer to it, is --

You got to be more specific. Because there's like a gross margin and a net margin. The number -- the number that's comparable to the 20 percent I gave you is a contribution to common cost and overhead above direct cost. You did not make any attempt in this chart to calculate Momentum's direct cost because you didn't include any of their costs, and you understated what you charge them.

Every time you ask me about one of these percentages, I feel compelled to explain to you again how wrong your calculations are. And I really don't want to use up the Commission's time that way. So if I could just have a standing criticism of the -- of the document, I'd appreciate it.

Q Did you look into any of the margins of any of your clients before you filed this testimony?

My clients operate in a competitive market. I mean, my -- the problem I have with your testimony is you all want to pretend you're competitive when you can't find a competitor. They operate in a competitive marketplace.

Whether it's today or six months from now, I will -- I'm confident that competitive forces will drive their margins to normal operating levels, where at the very least they have to compete against you, much less each other.

You don't have that. That's the problem.

- Q Mr. Gillan, what happens to your eight clients that have signed commercial agreements if this Commission adopts the rate that you're proposing?
- A I have not reviewed those agreements. I know this: They have no problem with the Commission adopting the rates that I'm proposing.
- Q So you think it's fair for the four clients who actually have UNE-P that you're representing here to get a lower rate than your eight clients who have signed commercial agreements and are bound by those for the next at least year-and-a-half?
- A First, I don't know that they're bound by them. I don't know what they signed in those agreements. Secondly, even if they're bound to them for the next year-and-a-half,

	it means they'd have a chance of survival after that.
2	There's the Commission can't deny the creation
3	of a just and reasonable rate in this proceeding because
4	some people signed commercial signed other agreements
5	that may have limited their options. None of those carriers
6	is asking the Commission to do this. The only carrier
7	that's making this point is BellSouth, and that ought to be
8	enough for you to understand its legitimacy.
9	MS. FOSHEE: Thank you. That's all the questions
10	I have.
11	COMMISSIONER BAKER: Any redirect, mister
12	Okay. Mr. Magness, you want five minutes?
13	MR. MAGNESS: Just five minutes. Appreciate it.
14	COMMISSIONER BAKER: Okay, we will take a quick
15	five minute break.
16	(A short recess was taken.)
17	COMMISSIONER BAKER: Mr. Magness, do you have any
18	redirect for your witness?
19	MR. MAGNESS: Yes, Commissioner.
20	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. MAGNESS:
22	Q To speed things up, there are a few things I'm
23	going to want to hand out. The first item.
24	MR. WATKINS: Mr. Chairman.
25	COMMISSIONER BAKER: Show Ms. Foshee what you're

handing out?

MR. MAGNESS: Yes, first is just a reproduction of the summary boards that Mr. Gillian used yesterday. We intended to provide these to the Commission yesterday and didn't. The second is a discovery response that we'll discuss in cross. The third is a trade secret item, this page with the chart. It's just a larger print version of the last page of CompSouth Exhibit 1 that was admitted yesterday. CompSouth Exhibit 1, last page, it's just blown up so the numbers are bigger.

MS. FOSHEE: I need to see Exhibit 1.

MR. MAGNESS: Well, here's Exhibit 1.

MS. FOSHEE: Okay.

MR. MAGNESS: Same thing. So we would certainly admonish the witness and all others not to reveal any of the numbers in that last item, because it is part of the confidential exhibit.

BY MR. MAGNESS:

- Q Okay, Mr. Gillian, Ms. Foshee asked you to accept something about CompSouth subject to check, would you accept that there are 20 members of CompSouth?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Not including AT&T and MCI?
- 24 A I accept that.
- Q And Ms. Foshee was discussing why particular

members at CompSouth would be, I guess, interested in the case. And let me -- if I can approach the witness and just show him these summary boards.

COMMISSIONER BAKER: Just identify the summary boards for the record, so there's some reference later.

MR. MAGNESS: Commissioners, this is the summary chart that shows the loop high capacity loop rates posed by CompSouth.

BY MR. MAGNESS:

- Q And Mr. Gillian can you see this?
- 11 A Yes.

1.5

Q Okay, and this is also what we handed out a moment ago, that's included in that package. This shows the high capacity loop rates that you're proposing in your testimony. If BellSouth's proposal of what that rate should be is accepted, what is that rate for the DS1 digital loop?

A Yeah, and I'll just go to that one, because that's where most of the demand is and there are higher rates for all of these. But the thing -- on that first line there, the loop to serve a medium sized business customer that a CompSouth member today pays \$50 for under 251, where it's listed we're proposing a just and reasonable rate of \$80 -- roughly \$86, about a 75 percent increase. The charge that BellSouth would apply under its interstate access tariff is \$179.15, this is -- this is not a small issue here. Because

you can imagine, customers have been gone out and attracted under a system where you're paying \$50 a month to connect to those customers, even raising it to \$85-\$86 is going to have an impact, 117 effectively three and a half times that would be impossible.

Q And similarly if we look at the chart that you prepared on transport rates, again, this is from Mr.

Gillian's summary charts to his testimony. The -- again if you compare the transport to what BellSouth would --

A Yes. Nothing is as easy as you hope. I did it just for a DS1 transport to illustrate it and I assumed it was ten miles. If you look under ten miles, it would be about \$36 at TELRIC rate.

Q When you say \$36, are you combining DS1 termination and per miles?

A Yeah, you have to put those together, pay about \$36 today; under our proposal that would go up to about \$45; BellSouth would want for that same ten-mile transport link, \$257.

Q Okay, and then --

A Actually, while you're on that one, because DS3 transport, today under our proposed rate we're talking about \$471 for a ten-mile loop -- or for a ten-mile DS3.

BellSouth's charge for that would be \$2436.

Q Okay, and finally, on the switching element where

you have a proposed rate, a flat rate of \$6.86, how does that compare to what BellSouth would charge for that?

A Again, under the staff -- and by the way, my usage -- the usage assumptions I used I've been able to look at a little bit, they're very close to what the staff used. So there's no issue being introduced by different usage assumptions. On average staff rates produce a rate of \$4.18. We're proposing a flat rate, it's fixed, give them the money of \$6.86, BellSouth would want for that same usage level \$11.18. So in effect we're proposing TELRIC plus \$2.88, which is the 65 percent increase and BellSouth would be almost, you know, over \$11 to -- for something that is used along with a loop to serve basic residential and business customers.

- Q And that rate you mentioned TELRIC plus, how much?
- A \$2.88 is the premium above Bell -- above the staff's calculation of TELRIC.
- Q Okay, and when we looked yesterday at the Exhibit
 CompSouth 1 --
 - A I'm sorry, \$2.78, yeah.
 - Q Okay, and when we looked a the Exhibit CompSouth

 1, which we reproduced the last page of, the confidential

 page here --
 - A Yes.

Q -- how does that compare, you say the CompSouth's

- proposal is TELRIC plus \$2.86.
- A On that \$2.78.

- Q \$2.78, and how does that compare with this -- with the standard, the S category, standard rate that's in most of those commercial agreements?
 - A Well, it'd be TELRIC plus \$7.00.
 - Q Okay, and then are there any that are different?
- A Yes, there were five carriers that negotiated -- negotiated rates.
- Q And those are reflected in this attachment from CompSouth 1?
 - A Yes, and I won't give any of the numbers, but you'll see that for four of them the ending rate is not significantly different then TELRIC plus \$7.00. But there's one carrier, carrier 12 that is if -- if that chart is accurate and it's BellSouth's chart and their witness testified yesterday that it's accurate, our proposal in this docket is significantly higher than the rate that they voluntarily have provided to carrier 12.
 - Q And Ms. Foshee also talked to you a bit about carriers' motivations for signing commercial agreements, do you remember that?
- A Yes.
- Q And I'd ask you to look at the other document that I've handed out, which is ITC^DeltaCom Communications Inc.

response to BellSouth Telecommunication Inc. first set of discovery requests in this proceeding, do you have a copy of that?

A No.

- Q Wow, I think everyone else does. Okay.
- A Thank you.

Q And we just reproduced one of the pages of the response attachment A concerning ITC^DeltaCom's residential local service offering. Could you explain to us what your examination of this discovery response indicated about at least one carrier, ITC^DeltaCom's, history with its commercial agreement?

A Yeah, ITC^DeltaCom signed a commercial agreement.

As it was getting ready to negotiate -- as it was negotiating that commercial agreement, which I think they signed in April of '05, it started out the year offering residential service, with the service described here with all these features and calling bundled in it around, of around \$35 a month. As they were negotiating and realized the type of prices that BellSouth was requiring, they increased it by \$5.00 a month. Now, they signed the agreement and -- but that doesn't mean -- this is a perfect illustration of of carriers signing an agreement, but not because they believe that the agreement is sustainable or gives a competitive opportunity at all. They sign it. They

raise the rate now up to \$50 a month. So, it's had an increase of \$15 a month and then that just takes them into the November time frame when they abandoned the residential market entirely -- entirely and withdraw.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And while this is one carrier, I think when you look at the pattern of the -- of the competitive lines under the so-called commercial agreements, they're not commercial and they're not agreements, they are people who have one provider in the marketplace, BellSouth, put in an environment where they can't handle moves, adds, changes, whatever without having some sort of agreement with BellSouth. But this interrogatory response illustrates quite well that you can't conclude from the fact that someone signed an agreement with the idea that somehow the rates in that were considered reasonable. reasonable, if what you want to do is get out of the market in six months -- well, they're not even reasonable then. But, you know, that's all it showed, is that they needed a bridging amendment to get them out of the market and the way they wanted to access. And that -- obviously 271 is not about transitioning carriers to a smoother market, access market abandonment.

Q Now, Ms. Foshee referenced -- I think she kept saying eight CompSouth members had commercial agreements, I guess, if you delete AT&T and MCI from that list, that would

be six according to her representation, right?

A I have no idea, she's never -- she never used the names of the carriers. I think she had already deleted AT&T and MCI ahead of time.

Q Okay.

A But, you know, this is about loops, transports and switching. It isn't only about switching. Switching people had dire consequences earlier than loops and transports, but the pricing issue and the pricing testimony is -- is about all three elements.

Q And to you knowledge are there members of CompSouth who are actively in the market trying to provide services that use DS1 loops and the DS1 and DS3 transport?

A Absolutely, I mean, for -- for carriers that are using their own switches ia a practical matter, that's the primary market that they're trying to address. Carriers, not traditional phone customers, but customers that have reached a point where they want a digital high speed connection for voice and data combined. And the way you connect to those customers are DS1s. So, what those -- the prices those carriers face for DS1 are a fundamental input to their business and whether or not they can continue to serve medium sized business customers in Georgia.

Q And do you typically experience any problems getting input from such clients as you prepared testimony

for CompSouth?

A I've never had client input problems in the sense that they were shy. Mr. Watkins is, after all, one of my clients.

- Q Exhibit A. On those loops and transport rates, there was discussion with Ms. Foshee concerning special access and the use of special access instead of UNEs. The paragraph 664, the "might" paragraph that we talked a whole lot about, that was in the TRO, right?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q Issued in 2003, thereabouts?
- A Okay, I'll accept that subject to check, yeah.
 - Q And then you discussed some analysis the FCC did with the hideous irony analysis you talked about, was that in the TRO or the TRRO?

A That was in the TRRO at the end of the follow-up proceeding of the TRRO. So, that would have been the FCC's first time that it actually even looked at whether special access might be usable for local exchange services. Now, admittedly they did do it for a different purpose, they did it for impairment instead of looking to see whether or not there was enough competition for pricing. But they did look at those special access prices in more detail for the question that's really relevant here, and that is, is that any evidence that these price levels can support

competition? And they concluded that there isn't. I think when you look at those, you know, \$50 going to \$179.00, that's a dramatic change in a carrier's cost structure.

Q And just -- just on this matter, just to be sure it's clear for the record, the -- the impairment test for loop and transport in the TRRO, I think you referenced they are based on proxy tests. And what -- what in your mind, I guess, what I'm trying to get is, what is the difference between the FCC saying there's plenty of competition there therefore there's no impairment versus what they did in using those test?

A I'll give the clearest example, I think in Atlanta there's a down -- there's a wire center in downtown Atlanta where the application of these criteria mean that DS1 loops aren't going to be available to serve any of the businesses served by that wire center under 251, you know, the way the these criteria apply. What did the Commission look at, and I mean, you look at this because this is what the FCC test required you to look at. You looked at, how many business lines are served by that wire center. How big is this area in downtown Atlanta, how many lines are there? And then you look to see how many carriers have actually collocated in the wire center, the building that the loops run out to, all right. There's no information there at all that tells you whether there's a single other way to reach those customers

than to buy loops from BellSouth. Because nowhere in that test do you actually answer the question hey, in this downtown area there's all these customers, carriers are today serving those customer, buying loops from BellSouth to reach them, can they go buy loops from somebody else. You don't look at that at all. And it's a bad -- it's my opinion it's a bad proxy, but that's what the FCC set up. So, all you did is you decided or applying the FCC criteria you conclude yes, there's a lot of business lines in this wire center, which you would expect, since there are a large number of CLEC that have collocated there to buy the loops. But now because of that criteria you're going to take away their ability to reach all those customers under 251. if BellSouth had their way you would replace it with hey, you've got to pay \$179.00 now to reach all these customers instead of what we're proposing of \$86.00.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Nowhere in that analysis that the FCC or that the Commission did, did anyone ever look out the window and say is there any other way to reach these customers other than BellSouth's loops? Is there a single other carrier that has any loops that go out to these businesses. And as a practical matter there's very, very -- it's very unusual to be able to find another carrier that has built facilities in the individual buildings that you can go buy loops from.

That's -- for better or for worse, mostly worse, that's what

FCC criteria called for, but, the backstop -- the competitive backstop -- the competitive protection is all right, you still get to pay just and reasonable 271 rates.

Q And just one final thing, to -- I want to discuss some of the questions that were raised about your methodology for establishing just and reasonable rates. Ms. Forshee noted that there were -- that you had proposed different rate levels as to switching in an FCC proceeding and then in this proceeding. And what additional information was available to you in this case that supported the methodology you're supporting here?

A I used the BellSouth cost studies that their witnesses identified as their belief at capturing their total forward looking costs. That information was not available in the other -- the other times that a rate proposal had to be made.

It's -- quite frankly, it just keeps showing why the state should do rate settings, the FCC is not good at setting rates, because the parties don't have an opportunity to collect the information.

Q And that -- that approach based on using forward looking costs, you think is appropriate?

A I think it still overstates what BellSouth should be getting for these facilities. But as I indicated yesterday as candidly as I felt comfortable, we recognize

1	that BellSouth wants to appeal this and we wanted to take
2	away as many appeal points as we possibly could take. And I
3	don't see how they're going to go to a judge and tell the
4	judge that somebody using their cost studies and then giving
5	them more money then they had asked for somehow is producing
6	rates that's unreasonable. They're not going to get there
7	with that.
8	Q How does the methodology that you propose compare
9	to what's called the new services methodology?
10	A It is basically the new services methodology. It

A It is basically the new services methodology. It is a direct cost, plus reasonable contribution, the common cost and overhead methodology. It's what the FCC calls the new services test.

MR. MAGNESS: Okay, that's all I have. Thank you. I would like to offer into evidence, I believe it's going to be CompSouth 4, the ITC^DeltaCom response to BellSouth's discovery request, the excerpt that we used in cross examination.

CHAIRMAN WISE: So entered.

(The document referred to was marked for identification as CompSouth Exhibit Number 4 and received in evidence.)

MR. MAGNESS: In addition, we'd ask that the information that we handed out, the summary sheets just be

1	included as a demonstrative exhibit.
2	CHAIRMAN WISE: As an exhibit?
3	MR. MAGNESS: Yes, we can call it CompSouth 5.
4	CHAIRMAN WISE: Okay.
5	MR. MAGNESS: Or illustrative, I'm sorry, not
6	demonstrative.
7	CHAIRMAN WISE: Marked and entered.
8	(The document referred to was
9	marked for identification as
10	CompSouth Exhibit Number 5 and
11	received in evidence.)
12	MR. MAGNESS: CompSouth 5, and finally, we would
13	ask that Mr. Gillian's testimony be moved into the record.
14	CHAIRMAN WISE: Will do.
15	(Whereupon, the prefiled testimony of Mr.
16	Gillan follows:)

1 CHAIRMAN WISE: Ms. Foshee? MS. FOSHEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I was 2 remised and forgot to mark three of the exhibits that we 3 4 used. If we could mark the Tennessee testimony of Mr. Gillan, as BellSouth 3. 5 6 The Momentum web page as BellSouth 4. 7 And the chart entitled UNE-P DSO with features as BellSouth 5. I haven't moved them yet I just marked them. 8 9 (The documents referred to were marked for identification as 10 11 BellSouth Exhibits 3, 4 and 5.) 12 MS. FOSHEE: Those are the only three that I would 13 like to mark. And now, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move those 14 into the record, please. CHAIRMAN WISE: They'd be put into the record. 15 16 MS. FOSHEE: Thank you. (The documents, heretofore marked 17 18 as BellSouth Exhibits 3, 4 and 5, 19 were received in evidence.) 20 MR. MAGNESS: Commissioner, we -- we very strongly 21 object to this chart. I think based on what we've heard, there's no foundation laid for this to be into evidence. 22 23 Ms. Foshee kept trying and trying to lay some sort of foundation through cross examination. Mr. Gillan kept 24 25 telling her that -- this -- that this was meaningless, it's

not evidence. And if BellSouth had wanted to lay a 1 2 foundation to put this in through one of its own witnesses, it had every opportunity, it didn't. It's not evidence. 3 4 CHAIRMAN WISE: Commissioner Baker, please. 5 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Mr. Magness, I understand the basis of the objection, but since it was so extensively 6 7 dissected by Mr. Gillan, I think he --he made it very clear what he thought of the exhibit and showed the shortcomings 8 of it and so, for reference purposes in the record I'm going 9 to rule to leave it in. 10 MS. FOSHEE: And then just lastly as a 11 housekeeping matter I'll remind the Commission that we do 12 have a pending motion to dismiss this proceeding; again, we 13 14 don't need to argue it. But at some point it probably needs 15 to be ruled on. CHAIRMAN WISE: Motion denied. Thank you very 16 17 much. Anything further, Commissioners? 18 (No response.) 19 CHAIRMAN WISE: Thank you very much. 20 (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at 3:05 21 22 p.m.) 23

24

CERTIFICATE

I, Peggy J. Warren, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages represent a true and accurate transcription of the events which transpired at the time and place set out in the caption, to the best of my ability.

Peggy J. Warren, CVR-CM, CCR A-171